

FILED

JUL 07 2020

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

1 Halima Zahib
2 Aurang Zaib Khan, Et Al
3 1969 East Cooley Ave.
4 San Bernardino, CA 92408

5 Unsecured Creditor In Pro Se

6 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
7 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
8 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

9 In re:

10 PG&E CORPORATION,

11 Debtor.

12 In re:

13 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
14 COMPANY,

15 Debtor.

16 Affects PG&E Corporation

17 Affects Pacific Gas and
18 Electric Company

19 Affects Both Debtors.

20 All papers shall be filed in the
21 Lead Case No. 18-30088 (DM)

22 Case No.:3:19-bk-30088 (Lead Case)

23 Chapter 11

24 Case No.:3:19-bk-30089

25 Chapter 11

26 UNSECURED CREDITOR CLAIM NO. 7083

27 NOTICE THAT THIS CREDITOR WILL
28 RECOVER ANY JUDGEMENT OBTAINED
IN ANY OTHER VENUE, THROUGH THE
CLAIM PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH
THE TERMS OF CONFIRMED PLAN OF
REORGANIZATION, OR LACK THEREOF,
OR DEFICIENT, NOT AGREED UPON BY ALL
CREDITORS, CONSTRUED AS UNRESOLVED
AND OUTSTANDING CLAIMS; AND
THAT THIS LIFT OF AUTOMATIC STAY
CANNOT PRECLUDE THIS CREDITOR TO
ENFORCE SUBSEQUENTLY OBTAINED
JUDGEMENT AGAINST DEBTOR, DUE TO
PREVIOUSLY, IN THIS COURT, ASSERTED
AS "NO" TO ANY PLAN'S TERM AND "NO"
TO ANY PLAN OF REORGANIZATION.

29 TO THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

30 The undersigned Creditor", In Pro Se, hereby notify this Court, that "Everyone has right
31 to be involved in this bankruptcy process – especially individual Creditors, poisoned with
32 Debtor's byproducts", and that this Creditor previously asserted as not agreeable to any plan.

1 This Creditor, strongly believe, that the Hon. Dennis Montali recollects
2 *Anderson, et al. v. Pacific Gas and Electric.* file BCV 00300. (Judicial Notice).

3 This Creditor, strongly believe, (another Judicial Notice) that the Hon. Dennis
4 Montali recollects that the Debtor is also a Convicted Felon, due to endless and countless
5 severe and “draconian” in nature gross negligence acts, such as San Bruno Gas Explosion,
6 Fire Victims, and a myriad of others, and obviously recollects one of oldest gross negligence
7 on this planet, being the ongoing murder of innocent inhabitants in the town of Hinkley,
8 California, that is now almost 70 years in complaints, and all of these draconian acts, since
9 1992 and subsequently since 2013 to present, that were evidenced by the massive cover-up
10 on this planet by the State of California Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board,
11 should bring light to the end of the tunnel. Well, partially, but better than nothing at all.

12 This Creditor noticed the difference between the artful and thwarted language as to
13 what the Debtor asserted (quote): “....*on the condition that such grant of relief from stay*
14 *does not permit the Hinkley Movants to enforce any judgment...*” *they might obtain against*
15 *the Utility, versus* what the Hon. Dennis Montali, Presiding Judge asserted (quote):
16 *“This order does not permit Movants to enforce any judgment they might obtain against*
17 *Debtors during the pendency of this case.”* There is a huge difference, “enforce any
18 judgement at any time, versus “enforce judgment during the pendency of this case,
19 A “draconian” Chapter 11 Case. Thank you Honorable Dennis Montali, Presiding.

20 As always, this Debtor have attempted to inject this Debtor mouth into Judges’
21 mouths, just name the Judge, initially in the mouths of the confused by this Debtor judges in
22 the U.S. District Court Central District of California – Riverside, causing the Judges at the
23 District Court to improperly dismiss all Plaintiffs’ Complaints, now in the Ninth Circuit, by
24 throwing out of the doors of that Court all of Plaintiff’s Complaints, not bases on any true,
25 genuine and uncontroverted evidence, but on “fake narrative” injected by the unscrupulous
26 counsels representing the Defendant - this Debtor, and most definitely will again notoriously
27 brainwash Ninth Circuit Court three judges, and inject Defendant’s (this Debtor) mouth
28 into the panel of the three judges. Count on it. Never ending “saga”. Judgement day is soon.

To that end, not only Creditor's attorneys for other victims, but Creditors In Pro Se, commonly provide information as to pros and cons of any plan to ensure that votes are made with all information having been considered. However, courts should not allow a party to circumvent the system by proposing or suggesting multiple plans, and conditions to stipulation, including but not limited to conditions which effectively deprives this Creditor to due process, not only in this Court, but in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and on remand this Creditor will be disenfranchised from voting on any plan, which has neither gained court approval nor been subject to adequate disclosure.

Not to be dissuaded, Debtor has refashioned not only his disdain for Debtors' Plan by not providing the full picture to this Court, nothing is further from the truth. In fact, Debtor may be the party providing inaccurate information in an attempt to garner support for a "plan" that is not court-approved and likely subject to sanctions under the very authority cited. Section § 1125(b) provides once a disclosure statement has been approved by a bankruptcy court and transmitted to creditors along with a plan or reorganizations, plan acceptances or rejections can be solicited. 11 U.S.C. §1125(b).

A soliciting party, not limited to this Creditor, may without prior court approval—(1) offer a narrative, evidence, conclusions, or opinions contrary to that enunciated in the plan or disclosure statement; (2) assert positions, evidence, conclusions, or opinions of relevant matters which are not contained in the plan or court-approved disclosure statement; or (3) offer evidence or opinions of an alternative liquidation analysis, since the debtors have a liquidation analysis as part of their disclosure statement. *In re Apex Oil Co.*, 111 B.R. 245, 249 (*Bankr. E.D. Mo.* 1990).

CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons above, which are not exclusive, unless massive Volume are place before the bench, and since this Creditor-Plaintiff-Victim of Crime, assertions were ignored and all objection to confirmation, and as to any plan to be confirmed, ware not included, nor any voting was ever offered by this Court, this Creditor must not ever being adjudicated as bankrupt and out of bankruptcy, until resolves all claims by all Creditors.

Dated: June 30, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

By: Halima Zahib
Halima Zahib

PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is:
P.O. Box HD, Barstow, CA 92311

A true and correct copy of the foregoing document entitled (specify): RELIEF FROM STAY COVER SHEET; MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY; DECLARATION AND REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY BY THE UNSECURED CREDITOR IN PRO SE; NOTICE OF HEARING ON MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY BY MEANS OF TELEPHONIC DEVICE 442-285-7450; NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE MOTION; NOTICE APPEARANCE AND REQUEST FOR NOTICE will be served or was served (a) on the judge in chambers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in the manner stated below:

1. **TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF)**: Pursuant to controlling General Orders and LBR, the foregoing document will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On (date) _____, I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following persons are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below:

Service information continued on attached page

2. **SERVED BY UNITED STATES MAIL**:

On (date) 04/ /2020, I served the following persons and/or entities at the last known addresses in this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that mailing to the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

Service information continued on attached page

3. **SERVED BY PERSONAL DELIVERY, OVERNIGHT MAIL, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OR EMAIL (state method for each person or entity served)**: Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 5 and/or controlling LBR, on (date) _____, I served the following persons and/or entities by personal delivery, overnight mail service, or (for those who consented in writing to such service method), by facsimile transmission and/or email as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that personal delivery on, or overnight mail to, the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

Service information continued on attached page

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

6-30-2020 Shirley Holcroft
Date

Printed Name


Shirley Holcroft
Signature

This form is mandatory. It has been approved for use by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.



Case: 19-30088 Doc# 8320 Filed: 07/07/20 Entered: 07/08/20 14:05:29 Page 6 of

PRIORITY MAIL
MEDIUM FLAT RATE
POSTAGE REQUIRED



TO:

United States Bankruptcy Court
For The Northern District Of California,
San Francisco Division
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 16 th Floor,
San Francisco, California 94102

Label 228, March 2016

FOR DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL USE